CF0000063072

Cri. 1682/2000 (2)

High Court of Madhya Pradesh
JABALPUR.
19 JUN 2000
Reg. No. 105
Recept Clerk
High Court, Jabalpur

Single Bench (Criminal)

XVI-189(Jail)C.J.P.R./9-94

APPEAL OF PRISONER

No. ST.NO. 185/99 Name - नीजमत

Father's name - बेवा लक्ष्मण

Residence - 315 वार्ड नं. - Age - 30 वर्ष

Sentenced to - पांच वर्ष एवम तीनवर्ष - दोनों सजा on - 15-5-2000

Under Section भाय-साथ-चलेगी / - by सत्र न्यायाधीश रायगढ़ (म.प्र.)

It is explained to the prisoner that if he states he wishes to be represented by a legal practitioner the appellate Court will not proceed with the case for seven days unless the legal practitioner appears earlier. If the legal practitioner does not appear within seven days he may not heard at all if the Prisoner states that he does not wish to be represented by legal practitioner the court may proceed at once with the case and will not be obliged to give a hearing to my legal practitioner who should appear.

1. Date of Application for copy of Judgement - संलग्न निर्णयप्रतिलिपि
2. Date on which copy received - 12-6-2000
3. Date on which Appeal sent - 13-6-2000
4. Whether the prisoner wishes to be represented or not - नहीं

No. ST.NO. 185/99 Name नीजमत बेवा लक्ष्मण

Confined in - केन्द्रीय - Jail - बिलासपुर (म.प्र.)

No. - 504 - Dated - 13-6-2000 1999

Forwarded to the श्री मान् अति॰ सेशे॰ साहब उच्चन्याय सहयोगदेश बिलासपुर

to gether with a copy of judgement or order passed in the case for favour of transmission to the proper Appellate Court.

अधीक्षक
केन्द्रीय जेल बिलासपुर

Jail

Date of receipt in ---------- Office ----------

Date of receipt of record to accompany the -----

Memo of Appeal to the Appellate Court -----

No. ----- Date .....199 ----------

Forwarded to the :-

Date of receipt in Appellate Court -----

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 2000

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	19.2.2007 Smt. Savita Tiwari, counsel for the appellant. Shri D.C. Pandey, Panel Lawyer, for the State. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that in this case, the entire sentences imposed upon the appellant vide judgment of conviction dated 15th of May 2000, which were 5 years R.I. and 3 years R.I. on two different counts and were directed to run concurrently, have already been undergone by the appellant and in view of the above, she does not want to press this appeal. She prays for dismissal of the appeal. The appeal is dismissed as not pressed. **Sd/-** **Sunil Kumar Sinha** **Judge**	

P.T.O.